

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement sheet of drawings includes changes to FIGS. 8A and 8B to identify those Figures as "Prior Art."

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of August 9, 2007, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto.

Claims 1-4 have been amended. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found in the specification at, for example, page 3, paragraph [0008] to page 6, paragraph [0014] and page 9, paragraph [0036] to page 11, paragraph [0041]. No new matter has been added by the amendments to the claims, and entry thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 are pending.

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified application are respectfully requested.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner asserts that the Information Disclosure Statement filed March 11, 2005 fails to comply with 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.97 and 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because a copy of Reference "CN 1376552A" has not been provided.

Applicant has obtained an English-language abstract of CN 137655A, and is submitting the same with a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement being filed concurrently herewith.

Double Patenting

The Examiner stated that if claim 1 is found allowable, claim 3 would be objected to as a substantial duplicate of claim 1, and if claim 2 is found allowable, claim 4 would be objected to as a substantial duplicate of claim 2.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3 and 4 as amended herein are not substantial duplicates of amended claims 1 and 2, respectively. For example, amended claims 3 and 4 claim the feature "a second blade section separated from said first blade section by a gap such that said first and second blade sections are approximately symmetrical around n axis of said shank section," which is not claimed in claims 1 and 2.

Withdrawal of the double patenting objection to claims 3 and 4 is respectfully requested.

Drawings

The Examiner noted that FIGS. 8A and 8B should be designated by a "PRIOR ART" legend because only that which is old is illustrated. Applicant submits herewith a Replacement Sheet of drawings showing FIGS. 8A and 8B, each bearing the legend "PRIOR ART." Withdrawal of the objection to FIGS. 8A and 8B is respectfully requested.

The Examiner also objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) because, as the Examiner asserted, the "gap" recited in claims 1-4 is not shown in the drawings.

Amended claims 1-4 recite "said first and second blade sections being separated by a gap," thus clarifying that the recited "gap" is between the first and second blade sections. Applicant respectfully submits that the "gap" as recited in amended claims 1-4 is clearly shown in, for example, FIG. 1(A) as a gap between first blade section 31 and second blade section 32; FIG. 4(A) as a gap between first blade section 61 and 62; and FIG. 5(A) as a gap between first blade section 91 and second blade section 92.

Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for the following reasons:

(1) Claim 1 and claim 2 recite "the edge" but there are two edges recited in the claims;

(2) Claims 1, 2, 3, and 4 recite "a gap," but the Examiner's review of the specification and drawings did not clarify what is considered to be "a gap."

Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection is moot in light of the amendments to claims 1, 2, 3, and 4. Specifically, claims 1 and 2 are amended to recite "an edge of said chamfering tool" and "an edge of an object to be worked so that the edge of the object is chamfered." Similarly, claims 3 and 4 are amended to recite "an edge of an object to be

worked so that the edge of the object is chamfered.” Applicant respectfully submits that the identity of the edge which is being referred to in all instances has been made clear, and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-8 on this ground is respectfully requested.

Amended claims 1, 2, 3, and 4 also recite “said second blade section being separated from said first blade section by a gap.” Applicant respectfully submits that amended claims 1-4 clearly recite what Applicant considers to be a gap, and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-8 on this ground is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by JP 11-104916 (JP ‘916). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-4 are independent.

As described in the English-language abstract, JP ‘916 describes “a cutter face having an edge line on a conical surface in the direction passing through the axial center of a truncated cone and a clearance angle β relating to the edge line is formed in a cutting tool having a truncated cone-shaped cross section and having a bottom part of a larger diameter than the hold diameter of a hold drilled in a section. An outer surface having a smaller distance from the outer surface of the bottom part than the diameter is formed successively in a cutter face base part to pass through the worked hole, and a shaft is implanted in the top part of the truncated cone. The cutting tool is rotated to conduct chamfering for the hole while the cutting tool connected to an electric motor is pulled out from the hole of the section after insertion of it.” Patent Abstracts of Japan, Abstract of JP 11-104916 (reference numbers omitted).

Applicant respectfully submits that JP ‘916 does not describe all of the features recited in the claims as discussed below.

Claim 1

Applicant respectfully submits that JP ‘916 does not describe at least the feature recited in amended claim 1 of “the outer surface having a first blade section which is tilted at

a first angle so that a chip cut by said first blade section is discharged to a side of the edge, and a second blade section separated from said first blade section by a gap, said second blade section being tilted at a second angle so as to face a direction different from the direction faced by said first blade section so that when the second blade passes through the chip, the chip is removed from the edge of the object,” and thus does not describe each and every feature recited in claim 1.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 over JP ‘916 and allowance are respectfully requested.

Claim 2

Applicant respectfully submits that JP ‘916 does not describe at least the features recited in amended claim 2 of “the outer surface having a first blade section having a first cutting face tilted at a first angle so as to face a first side of the edge of the object, and a second blade section separated from said first blade section by a gap, said second blade section having a second cutting face tilted at a second angle so as to face a direction different from the direction faced by said first cutting face so that a chip cut from the edge of the object in a first direction by said first cutting face is cut in a second direction by said second cutting face to remove it from the edge of the object,” and thus does not describe each and every feature recited in claim 2.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2 over JP ‘916 and allowance are respectfully requested.

Claim 3

Applicant respectfully submits that JP ‘916 also does not describe each and every feature recited in amended claim 3. For example, JP ‘916 does not describe at least the recited feature of “the outer peripheral surface having a first blade section which is tilted at a first angle so that a chip cut by said first blade section is discharged to a first side of the shank section, and a second blade section separated from said first blade section by a gap such that said first and second blade sections are approximately symmetrical around an axis

of said shank section, said second blade section being tilted at a second angle so that the chip is discharged to a second side of the shank section in a peripheral direction, and further so that when said second blade section passes through the chip, the chip is removed from the object.”

Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 3 over JP ‘916 is respectfully requested.

Claim 4

JP ‘916 also does not describe each and every feature recited in amended claim 4. For example, JP ‘916 does not describe at least the recited features of claim 4 of “the outer peripheral surface having a first blade section having a first cutting face tilted at a first angle so as to face a first side of the shank section, and a second blade section separated from said first blade section by a gap such that said first and second blade sections are approximately symmetrical around an axis of said shank section, said second blade section having a second cutting face tilted at a second angle so as to face a second side of the shank section, so that a chip cut from the edge of the object in a first direction by said first cutting face is cut in a second direction by said second cutting face to remove it from the edge of the object.”

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 4 and allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 5-8

Claims 5 and 7 depend from claim 3, and claims 6 and 8 depend from claim 4. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims also are allowable over JP ‘916 because of their dependence from allowable base claims 3 and 4 and further because of the additional inventive features recited therein. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5-8 and allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicants thus respectfully submit that claims 1-8 distinguish over JP ‘916 and allowance of the present application is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicant respectfully submits that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance with claims 1-8, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (404) 572-6900.

Respectfully submitted,
POWELL GOLDSTEIN LLP

By: /Jason A. Bernstein/
Jason A. Bernstein, Reg. No. 31,236
One Atlantic Center, 14th Floor
1201 West Peachtree Street NW
Atlanta, GA 30309-3488
Tel: (404) 572-6900
Fax: (404) 572-6999
jbernstein@pogolaw.com

JAB/JJB/mmd